



JUN 24 2009

Attorney Docket No. 0756-7836

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:) Group Art Unit: 2612
Yasuyuki ARAI et al.) Examiner: Jack K. Wang
Serial No. 10/594,308.)
Filed: September 27, 2006)
For: PRODUCT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM)
) CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
) I hereby certify that this correspondence is
) being deposited with the United States Postal
) Service with sufficient postage as First Class
) Mail in an envelope addressed to:
) Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,
) Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 23,
) 2009.

Adrian Stumper

RESPONSE

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

The Official Action mailed March 23, 2009, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on September 27, 2006; and January 15, 2009.

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 6, 9 and 10 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 3 of the Official Action rejects claims 1-12 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0217867 to Bridgelall and U.S. Publication No. 2004/0245519 to Van De Walle. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because the Official Action has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2144.04, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some reason, either